

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Status of All of the Claims

Below is the status of the claims in this application.

1. Claim(s) pending: 1, 4 and 7-9.
2. Claim(s) canceled: 2-3, 5-6 and 10-13.
3. Claim(s) added: None.
4. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None.

It is believed that the above-identified claims, as amended, are supported by the application as originally filed. Only claim 1 has been amended and the other pending claims have been previously presented. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be at least found in the final paragraph on page 5 of the specification.

Conclusion

The Examiner's principal rejection is a '102 rejection based on the disclosure in WO 99/20450 (Beck). The above amendments are intended to address this rejection and provide a claim which is not anticipated by Beck.

The Examiner's analysis of Beck in paragraph 3 of the Official Action is a good starting point for understanding the Beck disclosure. A further description is provided in the second complete paragraph on page 8 of Beck.

The Beck disclosure is understood to indicate that the projections on the mould half 28, and the longitudinal ribs 56 (with intermediate deepened portions 58) on the lower mould half 30, are provided only at two opposite ends of the mould. In contrast, the amendment to claim 1 is intended to make it clear that the claimed mould cavity is provided all around the filter element.

The conclusion regarding Beck that the projection 48 on the upper mould half 28 and the longitudinal ribs 56 on the lower mould half 30 are only provided at two opposite ends of the mould is based on a consideration of Fig. 1 of Beck. This shows the final moulded filter element and it will be appreciated that it is only at the left and right hand ends of the filter element that there are configurations corresponding to the cavity 42 in the mould (see Fig. 3). By inference, the projections 48 and 50 have only

been provided in the mould for contact with flat edges of the pleated filter element at opposite ends thereof. There is no suggestion that the longitudinal sides of the frame of the filter element shown in Fig. 1 have formations corresponding with either the cavity 42 of the mould or the projections 48 and 50. Therefore it is not clear that Beck discloses a mould cavity as defined in the above amendment for claim 1 which encircles the filter element.

The citations raised in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Official Action were directed at the dependent claims. It is submitted that claim 1 is patentable and that these dependent claims are allowable on the same basis.

It should be understood that the above remarks are not intended to provide an exhaustive basis for patentability or concede the basis for the rejections in the Office Action, but are simply provided to overcome the rejections made in the Office Action in the most expedient fashion. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this amendment the Examiner feels that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

February 15, 2010

By /Thomas Q. Henry, Reg. No. 28309/
Thomas Q. Henry, Reg. No. 28309
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
Telephone: (317) 634-3456 Fax: (317) 637-7561
Email: thentry@uspatent.com